1.0

1.1

1.25    1.4    1.6

1.8

2.0

2.2

2.5

MICROCOPY RESOLUTION TEST CHART
NATIONAL BUREAU OF STANDARDS 1963-A

NSWC/WOL TR 78-210

LEVEL

# INEQUALITIES AND APPROXIMATION WITH APPLICATIONS TO VSTOL AIRCRAFT

BY WILLIAM W. HAGER     JOHN W. WINGATE

RESEARCH AND TECHNOLOGY DEPARTMENT

3 DECEMBER 1978

DDC
RECEIVED
JUL 27 1979
C

Approved for public release, distribution unlimited

NSWC

## NAVAL SURFACE WEAPONS CENTER

Dahlgren, Virginia 22448  ●  Silver Spring, Maryland 20910

79 07 26 028

| REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE | | READ INSTRUCTIONS BEFORE COMPLETING FORM |
|---|---|---|
| 1. REPORT NUMBER <br> NSWC/WOL/TR-78-210 | 2. GOVT ACCESSION NO. | 3. RECIPIENT'S CATALOG NUMBER |
| 4. TITLE (and Subtitle) <br><br> INEQUALITIES AND APPROXIMATION WITH APPLICATIONS TO VSTOL AIRCRAFT | | 5. TYPE OF REPORT & PERIOD COVERED |
| | | 6. PERFORMING ORG. REPORT NUMBER |
| 7. AUTHOR(s) <br><br> William W. Hager and John W. Wingate | | 8. CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER(s) |
| 9. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS <br> Naval Surface Weapons Center <br> White Oak <br> Silver Spring, Maryland 20910 | | 10. PROGRAM ELEMENT, PROJECT, TASK AREA & WORK UNIT NUMBERS <br> 61152N; ZR00001; <br> ZR0140201 R0103 |
| 11. CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS | | 12. REPORT DATE <br> 3 December 1978 |
| | | 13. NUMBER OF PAGES <br> 24 |
| 14. MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS(if different from Controlling Office) | | 15. SECURITY CLASS. (of this report) <br><br> Unclassified |
| | | 15a. DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE |

16. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this Report)

Approved for public release, distribution unlimited

17. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20, if different from Report)

18. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES

19. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number)

Optimal control, error estimates, semidual method, VSTOL aircraft

20. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number)

A class of inequalities are discussed that are related to the following topics:

(1) Error estimates for variational inequality and optimal control approximation;

(2) Stability for mathematical programs; and

DD FORM 1473 EDITION OF 1 NOV 65 IS OBSOLETE
1 JAN 73
S/N 0102-014-6601 |

(3) Solution regularity for optimal control problems.

These results are used to study the error in the semidual method for approximating the solution to optimal control problems. The application of the semidual method to optimize VSTOL flight trajectories is discussed.

SUMMARY


This report surveys a class of inequalities related to variational inequality and optimal control approximation. The semidual method for control approximation is introduced, and the application of this method to the optimization of VSTOL aircraft trajectories is discussed. This research was supported in part by independent research at the Naval Surface Weapons Center.

*Paul R. Wessel*

PAUL R. WESSEL
By direction

Accession For

| NTIS GRA&I | |
| --- | --- |
| DDC TAB | |
| Unannounced | |
| Justification | |

By

Distribution/

Availability Codes

| Dist | Avail and/or special |
| --- | --- |

CONTENTS

## Introduction

In this survey, we discuss a class of inequalities related to the following topics:

(1) Error estimates for variational inequality and optimal control approximation

(2) Stability for mathematical programs

(3) Solution regularity for optimal control problems

Sections 1-6 provide the foundation for the semidual method for the numerical solution of control problems (Section 7). The semidual method was developed to solve problems for which the control and state constraints are fairly simple, but the system dynamics may be complicated. The optimization of VSTOL flight trajectories provides one important naval application of our method. In this case, the control constraints are the limitation on the nozzle angle $\delta$: namely $\delta_m \leq \delta \leq \delta_M$ where typically $\delta_m = 0°$ and $\delta_M \stackrel{\sim}{\sim} 100°$. On the other hand, the equations of motion for VSTOL aircraft are very nonlinear and complex.

In particular, let us formulate the minimum time problem for an aircraft such as the AV8A Harrier. Define the following parameters:

| | |
|---|---|
| x | – horizontal distance |
| h | – altitude |
| u | – horizontal velocity |
| v | – vertical velocity |
| $\theta$ | – angle of the plane with respect to the horizontal |
| $\delta$ | – nozzle angle with respect to plane center line |
| $\alpha$ | – angle of attack |
| M | – plane mass |
| T | – nozzle thrust |
| $C_D$ | – coefficient of drag |
| $C_L$ | – coefficient of lift |
| J | – moment of inertia about the pitch axis |
| S | – wing area |
| $\ell_a, \ell_t$ | – distance from center of gravity to lines of action of aero and thrust forces |
| q | – dynamic pressure |
| g | – acceleration of gravity |

The minimum time problem becomes:

$$\text{minimize } t_f$$

subject to

$$x(t_f) = h(t_f) = u(t_f) = v(t_f) = \theta(t_f) = \omega(t_f) = 0$$

$$\dot{x} = u$$

$$\dot{h} = v$$

$$M\dot{u} = T\cos(\theta+\delta) - qS(C_D\cos\gamma + C_L\sin\gamma)$$

$$M\dot{v} = T\sin(\theta+\delta) - qS(C_D\sin\gamma - C_L\cos\gamma) - Mg$$

$$\dot{\theta} = \omega$$

$$J\dot{\omega} = \ell_t T\sin\delta + \ell_a qS(C_D\sin\alpha + C_L\cos\alpha)$$

$$x(0), h(u), u(0), v(u), \theta(u), \omega(0) \quad \text{given}$$

$$\delta_m \leq \delta \leq \delta_M$$

See Section 7 for the semidual approximation to a control problem such as this.

## 1. Error estimates for quadratic cost

Consider the problem

$$\text{minimize}\{J(v) = a(v,v) + \ell(v) : v\epsilon K\} \tag{1.1}$$

where K is a convex subset of the Banach space $u$, $\ell(\cdot)$ is a bounded linear functional on $u$, and $a(\cdot,\cdot)$ is a symmetric, bounded bilinear form on $u$. Suppose that there exists a solution $u\epsilon K$ to (1.1), and let $K^h \subset u$ be an approximation to K. No assumptions are made regarding $K^h$; in particular, it need not be convex. If $u^h \epsilon K^h$ solves the problem

$$\text{minimize}\{J(v) : v\epsilon K^h\}, \tag{1.2}$$

we shall estimate the error $u-u^h$ in terms of energy $a(u-u^h, u-u^h)$.

Since K is convex and $J(\cdot)$ is differentiable, we have the standard variational inequality [1]:

$$DJ[u](v-u) \geq 0 \quad \text{for all} \quad v\epsilon K \tag{1.3}$$

---

1. Lions, J. L., Optimal Control of Systems Governed by Partial Differential Equations, translated by S. K. Mitter, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1971.

where

$$DJ[u](v) = 2a(u,v) + \ell(v). \tag{1.4}$$

Expanding $J(\cdot)$ about $u$ gives us:

$$J(u^h) = J(u) + DJ[u](u^h-u) + a(u^h-u,u^h-u). \tag{1.5}$$

Moreover (1.3) implies that

$$DJ[u](u^h-u) = DJ[u](u^h-v) + DJ[u](v-u) \tag{1.6}$$

$$\geq DJ[u](u^h-v)$$

for all $v \epsilon K$. On the other hand, since $u^h$ minimizes $J(\cdot)$ over $K^h$, we have:

$$J(u^h) \leq J(v^h) = J(u) + DJ[u](v^h-u) + a(v^h-u,v^h-u) \tag{1.7}$$

for all $v^h \epsilon K^h$. Finally combining (1.5)-(1.7), we get:

$$a(u^h-u,u^h-u) \leq DJ[u](v-u^h) + DJ[u](v^h-u) + a(v^h-u,v^h-u) \tag{1.8}$$

for all $v \epsilon K$ and $v^h \epsilon K^h$.

Special cases of (1.8) are the following:

(i) $K^h \subset K$. Choosing $v = u^h$ in (1.8) gives

$$a(u^h-u,u^h-u) \leq DJ[u](v^h-u) + a(v^h-u,v^h-u) \tag{1.9}$$

for all $v^h \epsilon K^h$.

(ii) $K = u$. Hence (1.3) implies that $DJ[u](v) = 0$ for all $v \epsilon K$ and (1.8) yields:

$$a(u^h-u,u^h-u) \leq a(v^h-u,v^h-u) \tag{1.10}$$

for all $v^h \epsilon K^h$.

A classical application of (1.8) is the obstacle problem [2,3] where we have:

$$u = H_0^1(\Omega)$$

$$K = \{v \epsilon u : v \geq \psi \text{ on } \Omega\} \tag{1.11}$$

$$J(v) = \int_\Omega [|\nabla v|^2 - 2fv]$$

2. Brezzi, F., Hager, W. W. and Raviart, P. A., "Error estimates for the finite element solution of variational inequalities," Numer. Math. 28 (1977), 431-443.
3. Falk, R. S., "Error estimates for the approximation of a class of variational inequalities," Math. Comp. 28 (1974), 308-312.

Here $\Omega \subset R^2$ is a bounded open set, $f \in L^2(\Omega)$, $H^m(\Omega)$ is the standard Sobolev space consisting of functions whose derivatives through order m are ~~square integrable~~ on $\Omega$, $H_0^1(\Omega) \subset H^1(\Omega)$ is the subspace consisting of *functions vanishing on* $\partial\Omega$, and $\psi \in H^2(\Omega)$ is the given obstacle. If $\partial\Omega$ is sufficiently regular, there exists a solution $u \in H^2(\Omega)$ for problem (1.1). To simplify the exposition we assume that $\Omega$ is a polygon although this restriction is easily removed [2].

Let $S^h \subset H_0^1(\Omega)$ denote a piecewise linear subspace that satisfies the standard interpolation bound

$$||g-g^I||_{H^k} \leq ch^{2-k} \qquad (1.12)$$

for all $g \in H^2(\Omega)$ and k = 0,1 where h denotes the diameter of the biggest triangle in the triangulation of $\Omega$ and c denotes a generic constant that is independent of h. Finally, we define the set

$$K^h = \{v^h \in S^h : v^h \geq \psi^I \text{ on } \Omega\}. \qquad (1.13)$$

Integrating by parts $DJ[u](v)$ given by (1.4) gives us

$$DJ[u](v) = \langle w,v \rangle, \quad w = -2(\Delta u + f) \qquad (1.14)$$

where $\langle \cdot,\cdot \rangle$ denotes the $L^2(\Omega)$ inner product. Furthermore, using the variational inequality, it can be shown that

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} w \geq 0 \\ w(u-\psi) = 0 \end{array} \right\} \qquad \text{almost everywhere on } \Omega. \qquad (1.15)$$

We now substitute $v = u$ and $v^h = u^I$ into (1.8); applying (1.14) leads to:

$$DJ[u](u-u^h) + DJ[u](u^I-u) = \langle w,u^I-u^h \rangle$$

$$= \underbrace{\langle w,\psi^I-u^h \rangle}_{\leq 0} + \underbrace{\langle w,\psi-\psi^I \rangle}_{= 0(h^2)} + \underbrace{\langle w,u-\psi \rangle}_{= 0} + \underbrace{\langle w,u^I-u \rangle}_{= 0(h^2)} \qquad (1.16)$$

$$\leq ch^2$$

since $w \geq 0$ by (1.15), $\psi^I-u^h \leq 0$ by (1.13), $||\psi-\psi^I||_{H^0} = 0(h^2) = ||u-u^I||_{H^0}$ by (1.12), and $\langle w,u-\psi \rangle = 0$ by (1.15). Similarly, we have

$$a(u-u^I,u-u^I) \leq ||u-u^I||_{H^1}^2 = 0(h^2). \qquad (1.17)$$

Combining (1.8), (1.16), and (1.17), we obtain the estimate:

$$a(u-u^h,u-u^h) \leq 0(h^2). \qquad (1.18)$$

Using quadratic elements and sharper regularity results established by Brézis [4,5], it can be shown that $||u-u^h||_{H^1} = O(h^{1.5-\epsilon})$ for any $\epsilon > 0$ [2].

## 2. Error estimates for differentiable cost

Now let us consider the equation: find $u \epsilon H_0^1(\Omega)$ such that

$$u''(x) = e^{u(x)} \text{ for all } x \epsilon \Omega \tag{2.1}$$

where $\Omega = (0,1)$ and let $u \epsilon H^2(\Omega)$ denote the solution. Defining the functional

$$J(v) = \int_\Omega [(v')^2 + 2e^v], \tag{2.2}$$

(2.1) is equivalent to the variational problem

$$\text{minimize}\{J(v) : v \epsilon K\} \tag{2.3}$$

where $K \equiv H_0^1(\Omega)$. Letting $S^h \subset H_0^1(\Omega)$ denote the space of continuous, piecewise linear polynomials with h = maximum grid interval, we select $K^h = S^h$ and consider the approximation (1.2).

The estimate (1.8) no longer applies due to the $e^v$ term included in $J(v)$. To generalize our earlier results, suppose that $J : u \to R$ is differentiable; hence, (1.3) holds [1]. Moreover, suppose that there exists $\alpha > 0$ such that

$$J(v) - J(w) - DJ[w](v-w) \geq \alpha||v-w||^2 \tag{2.4}$$

for all $v,w \epsilon u$ where $||\cdot||$ denotes the norm on $u$. Consequently, (1.5) can be replaced by

$$J(u^h) \geq J(u) + DJ[u](u^h-u) + \alpha||u-u^h||^2. \tag{2.5}$$

In addition, define the parameter

$$c(v,w) = \frac{J(v) - J(w) - DJ[w](v-w)}{||v-w||^2} \tag{2.6}$$

for all $v \neq w$. Hence (1.7) can be replaced by

$$J(u^h) \leq J(u) + DJ[u](v^h-u) + c(v^h,w)||v^h-u||^2 \tag{2.7}$$

for all $v^h \epsilon K^h$. Combining (2.5), (1.6), and (2.7), we get:

$$\alpha||u^h-u||^2 \leq DJ[u](v-u^h) + DJ[u](v^h-u) + c(v^h,u)||v^h-u||^2 \tag{2.8}$$

for all $v \epsilon K$ and $v^h \epsilon K^h$.

Now let us apply (2.8) to our particular equation (2.1). Observe that

4. Brézis, H., "Nouveaux théorèmes de régularité pour les problèmes unilatéraux," Rencontre entre physiciens theoriciens et mathématiciens, Strasbourg 12 (1971).
5. Brézis, H., "Seuil de régularité pour certain problèmes unilateràux," C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris Ser. A 273 (1971), 35-37.

$$DJ[w](v) = 2 \int_\Omega [w'v' + e^w v] \tag{2.9}$$

$$= 2\langle -w'' + e^w, v\rangle \text{ and}$$

$$J(v) - J(w) - DJ[w](v-w) = \langle (v-w)', (v-w)'\rangle \tag{2.10}$$

$$+ \langle e^\gamma(v-w), v-w\rangle \text{ by Taylor's Theorem}$$

where $\gamma(x)$ lies between $v(x)$ and $w(x)$. Hence we have:

$$\geq \langle (v-w)', (v-w)'\rangle$$

$$\leq \langle (v-w)', (v-w)'\rangle [\exp\{||v'||_{L^2} + ||w'||_{L^2}\} + 1] \tag{2.11}$$

since

$$||v||_{L^\infty} \leq ||v'||_{L^2} \qquad \text{for all } v\in H_0^1(\Omega) \tag{2.12}$$

$$\gamma(x) \leq ||v||_{L^\infty} + ||w||_{L^\infty} \qquad \text{for all } x\in\Omega.$$

Finally (2.1) implies that $DJ[u](v) = 0$ for all $v\in H_0^1(\Omega)$ and (2.8)-(2.11) yield for $v = u^h$ and $v^h = u^I$:

$$\langle (u-u^h)', (u-u^h)'\rangle \leq ch^2. \tag{2.13}$$

## 3. Error estimates for nondifferentiable cost

Consider the Bingham fluid problem that is given by (1.1) with the choices:

$$u = H_0^1(\Omega) = K$$
$$J(v) = \int_\Omega [|\nabla v|^2 + |\nabla v| - 2fv] \tag{3.1}$$

with $f\in L^2(\Omega)$. Letting $S^h \subset u$ denote the piecewise linear subspace of Section 2, we again take $K^h = S^h$ and study the approximation (1.2).

Observe that (2.8) cannot be utilized since $J(\cdot)$ is nondifferentiable. To generalize (1.8) or (2.8), suppose that

$$J(v) = J_n(v) + J_d(v) \tag{3.2}$$

where $J_n(\cdot)$ is convex but possibly nondifferentiable, and

$$J_d(v) = a(v,v) + \ell(v). \tag{3.3}$$

If $u\in K$ solves (1.1), then the following variational inequality holds [1]:

$$DJ_d[u](v-u) + J_n(v) \geq J_n(u) \tag{3.4}$$

for all $v \epsilon K$ where

$$DJ_d[u](v) = 2a(u,v) + \ell(v). \tag{3.5}$$

Hence we have

$$J(u^h) = J_n(u^h) + J_d(u) + DJ_d[u](u^h-u) + a(u^h-u,u^h-u). \tag{3.6}$$

Moreover, by (3.4), we find that

$$DJ_d[u](u^h-u) \_ DJ_d[u](u^h-v) + J_n(u) - J_n(v) \tag{3.7}$$

for all $v \epsilon K$. On the other hand, we observe that

$$J(u^h) \leq J(v^h) = J_n(v^h) + J_d(u) + DJ_d[u](v^h-u) + a(v^h-u,v^h-u) \tag{3.8}$$

for all $v^h K^h$. Finally the combination (3.6)-(3.8) yields:

$$a(u^h-u,u^h-u) \leq J_n(v^h) - J_n(u) + J_n(v) - J_n(u^h) \tag{3.9}$$

$$+ DJ_d[u](v^h-u) + DJ_d[u](v-u^h) + a(v^h-u,v^h-u)$$

for all $v \epsilon K$ and $v^h \epsilon K^h$.

Applying (3.9) to the Bingham fluid problem using $v = u^h$ and $v^h = u^I$, we obtain:

$$||\nabla(u^h-u)||^2_{H^0} \leq \langle|\nabla(u^I-u)|,1\rangle \tag{3.10}$$

$$- 2\langle \Delta u + f, u^I-u\rangle + ||\nabla(u^I-u)||^2_{H^0} \leq ch.$$

With a more careful analysis, one can establish the estimate

$$||\nabla(u^h-u)||^2_{H^0} \leq ch^{2-\epsilon} \tag{3.11}$$

for any $\epsilon > 0$. See Glowinski [6] for the details of (3.11).

## 4. Perturbations in the cost

In the previous sections, we studied the effect of replacing the constraint set $K$ in (1.1) by an approximation $K^h$. Now let us consider the case where the constraint set is fixed, but the cost functional is permitted to depend on a parameter.

---

6. Glowinski, R., "Sur l'approximation d'une inéquation variationnelle elliptique," R.A.I.R.O. Analyse Numerique <u>10</u> (1976), Number 12, 13-30.

For example, consider the quadratic programs:

$$\text{minimize}\{u^T R_j u + 2r_j^T u : u \epsilon K\} \tag{4.1}$$

for $j = 1,2$ where $K \subset R^n$ is convex. Suppose that there exist solutions $(u_1, u_2)$ to (4.1) associated with $j = 1,2$, respectively. Hence the following variational inequality holds:

$$(R_j u_j + r_j)^T (v-u_j) \geq 0 \text{ for all } v \epsilon K \tag{4.2}$$

and $j = 1,2$.

Choosing $(j = 1, v = u_2)$ and $(j = 2, v = u_1)$ and adding the resulting relations yields:

$$(u_2-u_1)^T R_2 (u_2-u_1) \leq (r_1-r_2)^T (u_2-u_1) + u_1^T (R_1-R_2)(u_2-u_1). \tag{4.3}$$

If the smallest eigenvalue, $\alpha$, of $R_2$ is positive, (4.3) implies that

$$\alpha |u_2-u_1| \leq |r_1-r_2| + |u_1| \, |R_1-R_2| \tag{4.4}$$

where $|\cdot|$ denotes the Euclidean norm. If $K$ is compact or $R_1$ is positive definite, then an a priori bound can be given for $|u_1|$; hence (4.4) implies that the solution to (4.1) depends Lipschitz continuously on the perturbation.

We introduce the following notation:

If $g : R^{m_1} \times R^{m_2} \times \ldots \times R^{m_\ell} \to R$, we let $\nabla_j g$ denote the gradient of $g(y_1, \ldots, y_\ell)$ with respect to $y_j$ where $y_k \epsilon R^{m_k}$ for $k = 1, \ldots, \ell$. The following generalization of (4.4) is easily established :

Theorem 4.1: Let $K \subset R^n$ be nonempty closed, and convex, $E \subset R^m$, $f : R^n \times R^m \to R$ be differentiable in its first n arguments on $K \times R^m$, and assume that there exists $\alpha > 0$ such that

$$f(y,\xi) \geq f(x,\xi) + \nabla_1 f(x,\xi)(y-x) + \alpha |x-y|^2 \tag{4.5}$$

for all $x, y \epsilon K$ and $\xi \epsilon E$. Then for all $\xi \epsilon E$, there exists a unique $x(\xi) \epsilon K$ satisfying

$$f(x(\xi),\xi) = \text{minimum}\{f(y,\xi) : y \epsilon K\}; \tag{4.6}$$

and given $\bar{x} \epsilon K$, we have

$$|x(\xi)-\bar{x}| \leq |\nabla_1 f(\bar{x},\xi)|/\alpha. \tag{4.7}$$

Also, if $\nabla_1 f(z,\cdot)$ is continuous for all $z \epsilon K$, then $z(\cdot)$ is continuous on $E$, and if, moreover, $\nabla_2 \nabla_1 f(\cdot,\cdot)$ is continuous, then

$$|x(\xi_1)-x(\xi_2)| \leq \frac{|\xi_1-\xi_2|}{2\alpha} \max_{0 \leq s \leq 1} |\nabla_2 \nabla_1 f(x(\xi_2), \xi_1 + s(\xi_2-\xi_1))|. \tag{4.8}$$

12

## 5. Dual approximations

One case where the perturbation parameter appears linearly in the cost of a program arises in the study of dual methods for mathematical programs. Consider the program

$$\text{minimize}\{f(z) : z\epsilon R^n, g(z) \leq 0\} \qquad (5.$$

where $g : R^n \rightarrow R^m$ and $f : R^n \rightarrow R$. The Lagrange dual function is given by

$$\mathcal{L}(\eta) = \inf\{f(z) + \eta^T g(z) : z\epsilon R^n\} \qquad (5.$$

and the associated dual problem becomes:

$$\sup\{\mathcal{L}(\eta) : \eta\epsilon R^m, \eta \geq 0\}. \qquad (5.$$

Under suitable assumptions, there exist solutions $\eta*$ to (5.3) and $z*$ to (5.1). Moreover, $z*$ achieves the minimum in (5.2) for $\eta = \eta*$.

Now define the set

$$K = \{\eta\epsilon R^m : \eta \geq 0\}, \qquad (5.$$

and let $K^h$ be an approximation to K. The following approximation to (5.3) is considered:

$$\sup\{\mathcal{L}(\eta) : \eta\epsilon K^h\}. \qquad (5.$$

If $\eta^h$ solves (5.5) and $z^h$ achieves the minimum in (5.2) for $\eta = \eta^h$, let us estimate $z* - z^h$.

Referring to our development in Sections 1-3, we see the need for an inequality of the form (2.4) and an estimate of the parameter c in (2.6). To attack these estimates, define the Lagrangian

$$\mathcal{L}(z,\eta) = f(z) + \eta^T g(z) \qquad (5.$$

and assume the following:

(i) $f,g\epsilon C^2$

(ii) there exists $\alpha > 0$ such that

$$\nabla_1^2 \mathcal{L}(z,\eta) > \alpha I \text{ for all } z\epsilon R^n \text{ and } \eta\epsilon E$$

where $E \subset R^m$ and $\nabla_1^2$ denotes the Hessian of $\mathcal{L}(z,\eta)$ with respect to z.

Letting $z(\eta)$ denote the minimizing value of z in (5.2), we know that

$$\nabla_1 \mathcal{L}(z(\eta),\eta) = 0 \qquad (5.$$

since the minimization is unconstrained. Moreover, by Theorem 4.1, $z(\cdot)$ is differentiable almost everywhere on E. Hence the chain rule and (5.7) give us

13

$$D\mathcal{L}[\mu](\eta) = \eta^T g(z(\mu)) \tag{5.8}$$

for almost every $\mu \epsilon E$. Motivated by relation (5.8) and our earlier development in Sections 1-3, we study the quantity

$$\mathcal{L}(\eta_1) - \mathcal{L}(\eta_2) - g(z(\eta_2))^T (\eta_1 - \eta_2). \tag{5.9}$$

The following result can be established:

$$\mathcal{L}(\eta_1) - \mathcal{L}(\eta_2) - g(z(\eta_2))^T (\eta_1 - \eta_2) \begin{cases} \leq -\dfrac{\alpha}{2} |z(\eta_1) - z(\eta_2)|^2 \\ \geq - |\nabla g(z(\eta_2))^T (\eta_1 - \eta_2)|^2/\alpha. \end{cases} \tag{5.10}$$

Therefore, proceeding as in Section 2, we get the estimate:

$$\frac{\alpha^2}{2} |z(\eta^h) - z(\eta^*)|^2 \leq \alpha g(z(\eta^*))^T (\eta^h - \mu + \eta^* - \mu^h) \tag{5.11}$$
$$+ |\nabla g(z(\eta^*))^T|^2 |\mu^h - \eta^*|^2$$

for all $\mu^h \epsilon K^h$ and $\mu \epsilon K$.

## 6. Ritz-Trefftz for optimal control

As an application of the results in Section 5, consider the following control problem:

$$\text{minimize}\{C(x,u) = \int_0^1 f(x(t), u(t), t)dt\} \tag{6.1}$$

subject to

$$\dot{x}(t) = Ax(t) + Bu(t) \text{ for almost every } t\epsilon[0,1]$$

$$x(0) = x_o$$

$$G(u(t),t) \leq 0 \text{ for all } t\epsilon[0,1]$$

$$x\epsilon a(R^n), u\epsilon L^{\infty}(R^m)$$

where $x : [0,1] \to R^n$, $u : [0,1] \to R^m$, and $a$ denotes absolutely continuous functions. The Lagrange dual functional associated with (6.1) is given by

$$\mathcal{L}(p,\lambda) = \inf\{C(x,u) + \langle p, \dot{x} - Ax - Bu\rangle \tag{6.2}$$
$$+ \langle G(u),\lambda\rangle : x\epsilon (R^n), u\epsilon L^{\infty}(R^m), x(0) = x_o\}$$

14

and the dual problem becomes [7]

$$\sup\{\pounds(p,\lambda) : (p,\lambda)\epsilon K\} \tag{6.3}$$

$$K \equiv \{(p,\lambda) : p\epsilon BV, P(1) = 0, \lambda\epsilon L^1, \lambda \geq 0\}$$

where BV denotes the space of functions with bounded variation. Under suitable assumptions [7], there exist solutions $(x*, u*)$ to (6.1) and $(p*, \lambda*)$ to (6.3). Moreover,

$$G(u*(t),t)^T\lambda*(t) = 0 \text{ for almost every } t\epsilon[0,1] \tag{6.4}$$

and $(x*,u*)$ achieve the minimum in (6.2) for $(p,\lambda) = (p*,\lambda*)$.

Now let $K^h \subset K$ denote the subset consisting of continuous, piecewise linear functions p such that $p(1) = 0$ and piecewise constant functions $\lambda$ such that $\lambda \geq 0$. As usual, "h" denotes the maximum grid interval. Consider the following approximation to (6.3):

$$\sup\{\pounds(p,\lambda) : (p,\lambda)\epsilon K^h\}. \tag{6.5}$$

Suppose that (6.5) has the solution $(p^h,\lambda^h)\epsilon K^h$ and that $(x^h,u^h)$ achieve the minimum in (6.2) for $(p,\lambda) = (p^h,\lambda^h)$. Let us estimate the errors $(x^h-x*)$ and $(u^h-u*)$.

Assume that $f,G\epsilon C^2$, the components of $G(\cdot,t)$ are convex for all $t\epsilon[0,1]$, and there exists $\alpha > 0$ such that

$$\nabla_1^2 f(z,t) > \alpha I \tag{6.6}$$

for all $z\epsilon R^{n+m}$ and $t\epsilon[0,1]$. Integrating by parts in (6.2), it can be shown that:

$$\pounds(p,\lambda) = -p(0)^T x_0 + \int_0^1 F(t)dt \tag{6.7}$$

where

$$F(t) = \inf\{f(x,u,t) - \dot{p}(t)^T x$$

$$-p(t)^T(Ax + Bu) + G(u,t)^T\lambda(t) : x\epsilon R^n, u\epsilon R^m\}.$$

That is, $\pounds(p,\lambda)$ can be expressed as the integral of a pointwise minimum.

---

7. Hager, W. W. and Mitter, S. K., "Lagrange Duality Theory for Convex Control Problems," <u>SIAM J. Control and Optimization</u> <u>14</u> (1976), 843-856.

Moreover, with the identifications

$$\eta = \begin{bmatrix} \dot{p}(t) \\ p(t) \\ \lambda(t) \end{bmatrix} , \quad z = \begin{bmatrix} x \\ u \end{bmatrix} , \text{ and}$$

$$g(z) = \begin{bmatrix} -x \\ -AX - Bu \\ G(u,t) \end{bmatrix} ,$$

we can apply the results of Section 5 for each time t and integrate over $t\epsilon[0,1]$ to get:

$$\frac{\alpha}{2}\{||x^h - x||^2_{L^2} + ||u^h - u^*||^2_{L^2}\} \le \langle G(u^*), \lambda^* - \mu^h \rangle \qquad (6.10)$$

$$+ C\{||\dot{p}^* - \dot{q}^h||^2_{L^2} + ||p^* - q^h||^2_{L^2} + ||\lambda^* - \mu^h||^2_{L^2}\}$$

for all $(q^h, \mu^h)\epsilon K^h$ satisfying $q^h(0) = p^*(0)$ where C depends on A,B, and $\nabla_1 G(u^*(\cdot),\cdot)$.

Now suppose that $(\dot{p}^*, \lambda^*)$ are Lipschitz continuous, select $q^h = p^I$, and let $\mu^h = \lambda^I$ = the piecewise constant function agreeing with the minimum value of $\lambda^*$ on each grid interval. Since $G(u^*(t),t) \le 0 \le \lambda^*(t)$ for all $t\epsilon[0,1]$ and (6.4) holds, we conclude that

$$\langle G(u^*), \lambda^* - \lambda^I \rangle = 0 \qquad (6.11)$$

while the remaining terms on the right side of (6.8) are $O(h^2)$. To summarize,

$$||x^h - x^*||_{L^2}, \quad ||u^h - u^*||_{L^2} = O(h). \qquad (6.12)$$

For additional results in this area, see [8].

7. <u>Semidual methods in optimal control</u>

In the previous section, we introduced a dual multiplier for both the differential equation and the control constraint. Now let us consider a semidual approach where a dual multiplier is only used for the differential equation. In particular, let us consider the problem

---

8. Hager, W. W., "The Ritz-Trefftz method for state and control constrained optimal control problems," <u>SIAM J. Numer. Anal.</u> <u>12</u> (1975), 854-867.

$$\text{minimize}\{C(x,u) = \frac{1}{2} \int_0^1 [x(t)^T Q X(t) + u(t)^T R u(t)]dt\} \qquad (7.1$$

subject to

$$\dot{x}(t) = Ax(t) + Bu(t) \text{ for almost every } t\epsilon[0,1]$$

$$x(0) = x_o$$

$$G(u(t),t) \leq 0 \text{ for all } t\epsilon[0,1]$$

$$x\epsilon a(R^n), \ u\epsilon L^\infty(R^m)$$

Define the set

$$U = \{u\epsilon L^\infty(R^m) : G(u(t),t) \leq 0 \text{ for all } t\epsilon[0,1]\},$$

and the **semidual functional**

$$\pounds(p) = \inf\{C(x,u) + \langle p,\dot{x} - Ax - Bu\rangle : x\epsilon a(R^n), x(0) = x_o, \ u\epsilon U\}. \qquad (7.2$$

The semidual problem becomes:

$$\sup\{\pounds(p) : p\epsilon K\} \text{ where}$$

$$K \equiv \{p\epsilon BV : p(1) = 0\}. \qquad (7.3$$

Suppose that Q and R are positive definite; hence, it follows from [7] that there exist solution $(x*,u*)$ to (7.1) and $p*$ to (7.3). Moreover, $(x*,u*)$ achieve the minimum in (7.2) for $p = p*$ and the following adjoint equation and minimum principle hold:

$$\dot{p}*(t) = -A^T p*(t) + 2Qx*(t) \text{ for almost every } t\epsilon[0,1], \qquad (7.4$$

$$M(u*(t),p*(t)) = \text{minimum}\{M(u,p*(t)) : u\epsilon R^m, G(u,t) \leq 0\} \qquad (7.5$$

$$\text{for almost every } t\epsilon[0,1], \text{ where}$$

$$M(u,p(t)) \equiv u^T Ru - p(t)Bu.$$

Let $K^h \subset K$ be the space of continuous, piecewise linear polynomials, and consider the following approximation to (7.3):

$$\sup\{\pounds(p) : p\epsilon K^h\}. \qquad (7.6$$

Suppose that $p^h$ solves (7.6) and that $(x,u) = (x^h,u^h)$ achieves the minimum in (7.2) for $p = p^h$. We study the errors $(x*-x^h)$ and $(u*-u^h)$.

Integrating by parts in (7.2), it can be shown that

$$\pounds(p) = \pounds_1(p) + \pounds_2(p) \qquad (7.7$$

where

$$\mathcal{L}_1(p) = -\frac{1}{2}\int_0^1 (\dot{p}(t) + A^T p(t))^T Q(\dot{p}(t) + A^T p(t))dt, \qquad (7.8)$$

$$\mathcal{L}_2(p) = -p(0)^T x_0 + \int_0^1 \gamma(p(t))dt \qquad (7.9)$$

$$\gamma(p(t)) \equiv \inf\{M(u,p(t)) : u\epsilon R^m, G(u,t) \le 0\}. \qquad (7.10)$$

Furthermore, it can be shown that $(x^h, u^h)$ satisfy relations (7.4)-(7.5) with "*" replaced by "h".

Since $\mathcal{L}_1(p)$ is a quadratic functional and $\mathcal{L}_2(p)$ is possibly nondifferentiable, we can apply the bound (3.9) choosing $v = p^h$ and $v^h = p^I$:

$$-\mathcal{L}_1(p^h-p\star) \le -\mathcal{L}_1(p^I-p\star) + \qquad (7.11)$$
$$2\langle \dot{p}\star + A^T p\star, Q[\dot{p}^I-\dot{p}\star + A^T(p^I-p\star)]\rangle + \mathcal{L}_2(p\star) - \mathcal{L}_2(p^I).$$

If there exists a continuous control $\bar{u}$ such that $G(\bar{u}(t),t) \le 0$ for all $t\epsilon[0,1]$, it follows from (7.4)-(7.5) that $\dot{p}\star\epsilon L^\infty$. Integrating by parts the $p^I-p\star$ term appearing in (7.11) and applying the interpolation estimate $||p\star-p^I||_{L^2} = O(h^2)$, we get:

$$-\mathcal{L}(p^h-p\star) \le ch^2 + \mathcal{L}_2(p\star) - \mathcal{L}_2(p^I)$$
$$\le ch^2 + \int_0^1 (p^I(t) - p\star(t))^T Bu^I(t)dt$$

where $u = u^I(t)$ achieves the minimum in (7.10) for $p(t) = p^I(t)$. Applying (4.7), $||u^I||_{L^\infty}$ is bounded uniformly in h, and (7.12) gives us:

$$-\mathcal{L}_1(p^h-p\star) \le ch^2. \qquad (7.13)$$

Since $p^h(1) = p\star(1) = 0$, we show in [9] that there exists a constant $\beta > 0$ such that

$$\beta||p^h-p\star||_{H^1}^2 \le -\mathcal{L}_1(p^h-p\star). \qquad (7.14)$$

Therefore, we obtain

$$||p^h-p\star||_{H^1} \le ch. \qquad (7.15)$$

Since $(p^h, x^h)$ satisfy (7.4) with "*" replaced by "h", (7.14) also implies that

$$||x\star-x^h||_{L^2} \le ch. \qquad (7.16)$$

---

9. Hager, W. W., "Rates of convergence for discrete approximations to problems in control theory," Ph.D. dissertation, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 1974.

Finally we combine the inequality (7.14), relation (7.5) with "*" replaced by "h", and the quadratic program stability bound (4.4) to get:

$$||u*-u^h||_{L^2} \leq ch. \tag{7.17}$$

## 8. Lipschitz continuity for constrained processes

In the previous sections, we studied the effect on a program of replacing a constraint set K by an approximation $K^h$, and the dependence of the solution to a program on a parameter appearing in the cost. Now we study stability (or more specifically Lipschitz continuity) in the abstract setting of a "constrained process".

A constrained process can be described as follows: Let $\delta$ be a Banach space, $\mathcal{D}$ be a convex subset of a Banach space, $z : \mathcal{D} \to \delta$, and $c : \mathcal{D} \to$ (power set of $\{1,\ldots,n\}$). Two examples of constrained processes are the following:

(1) A control problem such as (6.1) with optimal solution (x*,u*); we choose $\mathcal{D} = [0,1]$, the time interval, z(d) = (x*(d),u*(d)), and c(d) = indices of the binding constraints associated with u*(d).

(2) A mathematical program such as

$$\text{minimize}\{f(x,\xi) : x\epsilon R^n, g(x,\xi) \leq 0\} \tag{8.1}$$

where $\xi\epsilon R^m$ is a given parameter. Suppose that there exists a solution $x(\xi)$ to (8.1) for $\xi\epsilon\mathcal{D} \subset R^m$, a convex subset. We then choose z(d) = x(d) and c(d) = indices of the binding constraints associated with x(d).

Our goal is to estimate the Lipschitz constant for $z(\cdot)$. First consider the program (8.1), and let #c(d) denote the number of elements in the set c(d). Recall that the Kuhn-Tucker conditions give us a system of n + #c($\xi$) equations in the same number of unknowns: $x(\xi)$ and the dual multipliers associated with binding constraints. If $c(\xi_1) = c(\xi_2)$, then $|x(\xi_1) - x(\xi_2)|$ can often be estimated in terms of $|\xi_1-\xi_2|$ using the implicit function theorem. Similar results apply to the control problem but with the Kuhn-Tucker conditions replaced by the Pontryagin minimum principle and the adjoint equation.

On the other hand, suppose that $c(\xi_1) \neq c(\xi_2)$. A key result on this subject is given; namely, a Lipschitz constant that is valid for compatible parameters (where the binding constraints agree) is also valid for noncompatible parameters. To be more precise, assume that $z(\cdot)$ is continuous, and $c(\cdot)$ has the following property:

If $\{d_k\} \subset \mathcal{D}$, $d_k \to d\epsilon\mathcal{D}$ as $k \to \infty$, and $I \subset c(d_k)$ for all k, then $I \subset c(d)$.

Given $d,e\epsilon\mathcal{D}$, we define the segment

$$[d,e] = \{(1-\lambda)d + \lambda e : 0 \leq \lambda \leq 1\}$$

and we say that (d,e) are <u>compatible</u> if c(d) = c(e) and $c(\delta) \subset c(d)$ for all $\delta\epsilon[d,e]$.

19

Theorem 8.1: If $\gamma$ satisfies

$$||z(d) - z(e)|| \leq \gamma ||d-e|| \qquad (8.2)$$

for all compatible data $(d,e)\epsilon\mathcal{D} \times \mathcal{D}$, then $\gamma$ satisfies (8.2) for all data $(d,e)\epsilon\mathcal{D} \times \mathcal{D}$.

## REFERENCES

1.  Lions, J. L., <u>Optimal Control of Systems Governed by Partial Differential Equations</u>, translated by S. K. Mitter, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1971.

2.  Brezzi, F., Hager, W. W. and Raviart, P. A., "Error Estimates for the Finite Element Solution of Variational Inequalities," <u>Numer. Math.</u> <u>28</u> (1977), 431-443.

3.  Falk, R. S., "Error Estimates for the Approximation of a Class of Variational Inequalities," <u>Math. Comp.</u> <u>28</u> (1974), 308-312.

4.  Brézis, H., "Nouveaux théorèmes de régularité pour les problèmes unilatéraux," Rencontre entre physiciens théoriciens et mathématiciens, Strasbourg <u>12</u> (1971).

5.  Brézis, H., "Seuil de régularité pour certain problèmes unilateràux," C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris Ser. A <u>273</u> (1971), 35-37.

6.  Glowinski, R., "Sur l'approximation d'une inéquation variationnelle elliptique," R.A.I.R.O. Analyse Numerique <u>10</u> (1976), Number 12, 13-30.

7.  Hager, W. W. and Mitter, S. K., "Lagrange Duality Theory for Convex Control Problems," <u>SIAM J. Control and Optimization</u> <u>14</u> (1976), 843-856.

8.  Hager, W. W., "The Ritz-Trefftz Method for State and Control Constrained Optimal Control Problems," <u>SIAM J. Numer. Anal.</u> 12 (1975), 854-867.

9.  Hager, W. W., "Rates of Convergence for Discrete Approximations to Problems in Control Theory," Ph.D. dissertation, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 1974.

DISTRIBUTION

Naval Air Development Center
Attn:  Ronald L. Nave
       Dr. Carmen Mazza
Warminster, PA  18974

Naval Air Systems Command
Attn:  Dr. H. J. Mueller, NAIR-310
Washington, D.C.  20361

Naval Sea Systems Command
Attn:  SEA-03B
Washington, D.C.  20361

Office of Naval Research
Attn:  Dr. Stuart Brodsky, ONR-607
Washington, D.C.  20360

Defense Documentation Center                                    12
Cameron Station
Alexandria, Virginia  22314

TO AID IN UPDATING THE DISTRIBUTION LIST
FOR NAVAL SURFACE WEAPONS CENTER, WHITE
OAK TECHNICAL REPORTS PLEASE COMPLETE THE
FORM BELOW:

TO ALL HOLDERS OF __NSWC/WOL/TR 78-210__
        by William W. Hager, Code R-44
DO NOT RETURN THIS FORM IF ALL INFORMATION IS CURRENT

A. FACILITY NAME AND ADDRESS (OLD) (Show Zip Code)

NEW ADDRESS (Show Zip Code)

B. ATTENTION LINE ADDRESSES:

C.

☐ REMOVE THIS FACILITY FROM THE DISTRIBUTION LIST FOR TECHNICAL REPORTS ON THIS SUBJECT.

D.

NUMBER OF COPIES DESIRED _____

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
NAVAL SURFACE WEAPONS CENTER
WHITE OAK, SILVER SPRING, MD. 20910

———————

OFFICIAL BUSINESS
PENALTY FOR PRIVATE USE, $300

POSTAGE AND FEES PAID
DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
DOD 316

COMMANDER
NAVAL SURFACE WEAPONS CENTER
WHITE OAK, SILVER SPRING, MARYLAND 20910

ATTENTION: CODE  R-44